

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION	
10/642,283	1	08/18/2003	Wataru Kakinoki	36856.1112	2453
	7590	08/08/2005	•	EXAMINER	
Keating & Bennett LLP				NGUYEN, HUNG THANH	
Suite 312 10400 Eaton	n Place		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Fairfax, VA 22030				2841	
				DATE MAILED: 08/08/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Applica	tion No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/642	283	KAKINOKI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examin	er	Art Unit				
	HUNG	Γ. NGUYEN	2841				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s	filed on <u>27 August 20</u>	<u>02</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL .	2b)⊠ This action is	non-final.					
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Revie 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-14-		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/27/03</u> .	9 01 F10/30/00)	6) Other:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				

Art Unit: 2841

DETAILED ACTIONClaim

Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Weisburn et al. (US 5259498).

Regard claim 1: Weisburn et al. discloses in figure 2 an appearance protective case, comprising: a sheet member (51) including a draw-processed sheet member (51) treated with coloring or marking and a transparent or translucent cover case (2 and 3); wherein the sheet member (51) is fitted into the cover case (2 and 3) such that the sheet member (51) extends in close contact with an inner surface of the cover case (2 and 3).

Regard claim 5: Weisburn et al. discloses the appearance protective case wherein the sheet member (51) comprises paper (see column 6, line 35-44).

Regard claim 7: Weisburn et al. discloses in 4 the appearance protective case wherein the cover case (2 and 3) and the sheet member (51) are firmly fixed to each other (see column 5 line 35-46).

Regard claim 8: Weisburn et al. discloses in figure 2 an appearance protective case assembly, comprising: a frame (1) having a groove (56) formed along at least one side thereof; a sheet member (51) including a draw-processed sheet

member treated with coloring or marking and a transparent or translucent cover case (2 and 3); wherein at least one side of the sheet member (51) is inserted into the groove (56) of the frame, and the transparent or translucent cover case (2 and 3) and the frame are firmly fixed to each other so as to sandwich and hold a portion of the sheet member (51), including said at least one side.

Regard claim 9: Weisburn et al. disclose in figure 4 the appearance protective case wherein the sheet member (51) comprises at least one flange (see column 5, line 39-46, the sheet has at least 1 flange) at the front thereof such that the flange is sandwiched and held by the cover case (2 and 3) and the frame (1).

Regard claim 14: Weisburn discloses in figure 3 the appearance protective case assembly wherein steps (gap between 56 and 1) are formed in the groove (56) of the frame (1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Art Unit: 2841

Claim 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weisburn et al. (US 5259498) in view of Nakayama (US 6413630) and Jones et al. (US 6438638)

Regard claim 2: Weisburn et al. discloses all the elements of the appearance protective case assembly as described above respect to claim 1 except, Weisburn et al. does not disclose the appearance protective case according to Claim 1, wherein the sheet member includes a decorative film comprising resin.

Nakayama discloses the decorative film comprising resin (see column 1, line 20 and further)

Weisburn et al. and Nakayama are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor to decorate cases.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to make decorative film comprise resin of Weisburn et al. as taught by Nakayama.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Weisburn et al. and Nakayama for the benefit of being able to decorate their products.

Regard claim 3 and 4: Weisburn et al. discloses all the elements of the appearance protective case assembly as described above respect to claim 1 except, Weisburn et al. does not disclose the appearance protective case wherein the decorative film comprises a transparent film (see abstract and further) having a rear/front surface treated with coloring or marking.

Art Unit: 2841

Nakayama discloses disclose the appearance protective case wherein the decorative film comprises a transparent film (see abstract and further) having a rear/front surface treated with coloring or marking.

Weisburn et al. and Nakayama are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor to decorate cases.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to make decorative film of Weisburn et al. as taught by Nakayama.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Weisburn et al. and Nakayama for the benefit of being able to decorate their products.

Regard claim 6: Weisburn et al. discloses all the elements of the appearance protective case assembly as described above respect to claim 1 except, Weisburn et al. does not disclose the appearance protective case wherein the sheet member (explain in claim 1) comprises a metal sheet (see abstract and further).

Nakayama discloses the appearance protective case wherein the sheet member (explain in claim 1) comprises a metal sheet (see abstract and further).

Weisburn et al. and Nakayama are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor decorate cases.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to make metal sheet of Weisburn et al. as taught by Nakayama.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Weisburn et al. and Nakayama for the benefit of being able to decorate their products.

Art Unit: 2841

Regard claim 10: Weisburn et al. discloses all the elements of the appearance

protective case assembly as described above respect to claim 8 except,

Weisburn et al. does not disclose the a circuit board, wherein the circuit board is

sandwiched and held by the appearance protective case (explain above) and the

frame (explain above) such that the sheet member (explain above) and the frame

(explain above) lie in contact with opposing surfaces of the circuit board.

Jones et al. discloses in figures 2A-3B the a circuit board (circuit included storage

reside inside the SD, MMC, MEMORY STICK etc), wherein the circuit board

(circuit included storage reside inside the SD, MMC, MEMORY STICK etc) is

sandwiched and held by the appearance protective case and the frame (explain

above) such that the sheet member and the frame lie in contact with opposing

surfaces of the circuit board ((circuit included storage reside inside the SD, MMC,

MEMORY STICK etc)

Weisburn et al. and Nakayama are analogous art because they are from the

same field of endeavor to decorate cases.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Weisburn et al. and

Nakayama for the benefit of being able to decorate their products.

Regard claim 11: Weisburn et al. discloses all the elements of the appearance

protective case assembly as described above respect to claim 8 except,

Weisburn et al. does not disclose the appearance protective case assembly

further comprising an upper metal cover (see abstract and further can be

disposed anywhere depending on market requirement) firmly fixed to the cover

case (explain above) and the frame (explain above), and a lower metal cover

Art Unit: 2841

(see abstract and further can be disposed anywhere depending on market requirement) firmly fixed to the frame (explain above) such that at least a colored or marked pattern printed on the sheet member is exposed.

Nakayama discloses disclose the appearance protective case assembly further comprising an upper metal cover (see abstract and further can be disposed anywhere depending on market requirement) firmly fixed to the cover case and the frame (explain above), and a lower metal cover (explain above) firmly fixed to the frame such that at least a colored or marked pattern printed on the sheet member (explain above) is exposed.

Weisburn et al. and Nakayama are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor to decorate cases.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Weisburn et al. and Nakayama for the benefit of being able to decorate their products.

Regard claim 12: Weisburn et al. discloses all the elements of the appearance protective case assembly as described above respect to claim 8 except, Weisburn et al. does not disclose a Compact Flash card comprising the appearance protective case assembly.

Jones et al. discloses a Compact Flash card comprising the appearance protective case assembly.

Weisburn et al. and Nakayama are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor to decorate cases.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Weisburn et al. and Nakayama for the benefit of being able to decorate their products.

Application/Control Number: 10/642,283 Page 8

Art Unit: 2841

Regard claim 13: Weisburn et al. discloses all the elements of the appearance

protective case assembly as described above respect to claim 1 except,

Weisburn et al. does not disclose the appearance protective case wherein the

decorative film is made of one of polystyrene, acrylonitrile-butadiene-styrene

copolymer, acrylonitrile-styrene copolymer, polyvinyl chloride, methacrylic resin,

cellulosic resin, polycarbonate, polyethylene, polypropylene, polyvinylidene

chloride, polyacetal, polyamide, and fluorocarbon resin.

Nakayama discloses the appearance protective case wherein the decorative film

is made of one of polystyrene, acrylonitrile-butadiene-styrene copolymer,

acrylonitrile-styrene copolymer, polyvinyl chloride, methacrylic resin, cellulosic

resin, polycarbonate, polyethylene, polypropylene, polyvinylidene chloride,

polyacetal, polyamide, and fluorocarbon resin.

Weisburn et al. and Nakayama are analogous art because they are from the

same field of endeavor to decorate cases.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Weisburn et al. and

Nakayama for the benefit of being able to decorate their products.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800